

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

FILED

OCT 13 2016 *RB*

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Theodore Luczak #B-00780
Plaintiff,

vs.

Randy Pfister, et al.,
Defendant's,

Case No. 16-cv-2663

Honorable

Matthew F. Kennelly
Judge Presiding

MOTION FOR A
JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

Now comes plaintiff, Theodore Luczak, pro-se;
seeking a Judgment On The Pleadings as follows:

Rule 60(b) Motion; filed on July 14, 2016, docket
number 21.

Motion For Sanctions; filed on August 22, 2016,
docket number 22.

As the plaintiff just filed a Motion For A Temporary Restraining Order, as plaintiff is in Imminent Danger, and the defendant's are just further retaliating by subjecting plaintiff to more danger, as follows:

- (1) That on August 27, 2016, plaintiff filed an Emergency Grievance to defendant Randy Pfister, informing him that plaintiff was at a substantial risk of personal injury, as the Security Threat Group (STG Latin Kings). (See Exhibit #1)
- (2) That on September 1, 2016, defendant Pfister refused to expedite plaintiff's grievance as an emergency. (See Exhibit #1)
- (3) That prior to said grievance, plaintiff had submitted a grievance to the Administrative Review Board, requesting a Transfer to the Hill C.C., and plaintiff stated within this grievance that he was being transferred from Pontiac to Stateville to Menard, as a retaliatory action due to his litigation which is unlawful. Hoskins v. Lenear, 395 F.3d 372, 375.

(4) That on August 30, 2016, plaintiff's counselor responded to his grievance stating that plaintiff was submitted for transfer to Hill. (See Exhibit #2)

(5) That on September 18, 2016, plaintiff was informed that he was denied at the institutional level, for a transfer to Hill C.C., based upon a disciplinary report that was expunged by the Acting Director on January 15, 2016. Plaintiff was informed that the disciplinary report was still on file as Guilty. (See Exhibit #3)

(6) That the plaintiff was also informed that his aggression level would remain an 11 until the disciplinary report is removed, and now plaintiff is being forced to be placed in a cell with inmates that are staff assaulters.

(7) That on September 28, 2016, plaintiff once again requested to be placed in protective custody, and on September 29, 2016, plaintiff was interviewed by Internal Affairs, who informed plaintiff that their office approved his transfer to Hill C.C., and that they did not understand why plaintiff was denied

.. transfer to Hill C.C., and now plaintiff is also still being denied protective custody.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff is seeking a Judgment on all his pleadings filed as he is in imminent danger.

1st Theodore Luczak

Theodore Luczak

Plaintiff Pro-Se